

Remarks

Applicant has amended claims 18-19 and 21-24; and cancelled claim 20. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter was added by the amendment, as all of the amended matter was either previously illustrated or described in the drawings, written specification and/or claims of the present application. (See, p. 5, Ins. 3-27 & FIG. 1) Entry of the amendment and favorable consideration thereof is earnestly requested.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the specification and claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, stating that "[t]he claim terminology "elastic dispersion" is indefinite", Applicant notes that the term "elastic dispersion" is not used in any of the pending claims. (Official Action 3/31/03, pp. 2-3)

As amended, all claims recite a stationary light-guiding object provided substantially in the form of a ring, the stationary light-guiding object having a lateral irradiation surface, a moveable stimulation unit where the moveable stimulation unit moves relative to said stationary light-guiding object to form a rotary optical receiving device. In addition, all the claims recite an "irradiation surface extending along a length of the stationary light-guiding object for receiving optical signals transmitted by a moveable stimulation unit." Applicant respectfully submits that none of the identified prior art discloses or teaches these limitations.

For example, U.S. Patent No. 5,335,109 (Heidemann) discloses that light impinges upon "an erbium-doped fiber (EDF) 3" at a first end portion and exits at a second end portion. (See, FIG. 1) Nowhere does Heidemann teach, disclose or suggest a lateral a lateral irradiation surface on a stationary light-guiding object that receives light from a moveable stimulation unit. Applicant also notes that Heidemann cannot be used with a movable unit because the EDF 3 disclosed in Heidemann can only receive light at a single location and not along its length at multiple locations as is necessary for a

rotary optical receiving device. Accordingly, Heidemann cannot render the pending claims obvious. Applicant also further notes that Erdogan et al. fails to teach these limitations.

Applicant notes that that present application has a priority date of June 27, 1997 from PCT/DE 1997/01346. The present application represents a significant innovation over known rotary optical receiving devices. For example, while certain systems were using Bragg grating to selectively receive transmitted light to be transmitted along an optical transmission path, none of the cited art teaches or discloses a system that comprises an stimulation unit that moves relative to a stationary light-guiding object. These systems that used Bragg gratings could only receive light at the location of the grating and therefore could not be used or even modified to receive light along a length of the optical transmission path and therefore could not be used for rotary optical applications. As such, the currently pending claims cannot be obvious in view of the cited prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 18-19 and 21-24, all of the claims remaining in the application, are in order for allowance and early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 29, 2007

/Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr./
Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr., Registration No. 33,558
Steven B. Simonis, Registration No. 54,449
Attorneys for Applicant
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, CT 06905-5619
Tel. 203 324-6155